



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/615,954	07/10/2003	Hoi-Sing Kwok	016660-164	1065

7590 10/20/2006

James A. LaBarre  
BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.  
P.O. Box 1404  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404

EXAMINER

DUDA, KATHLEEN

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1756

DATE MAILED: 10/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/615,954

Applicant(s)

KWOK ET AL.

Examiner

Kathleen Duda

Art Unit

1756

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 August 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 20-31 and 34-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 39 and 40 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 20-31 and 37, 38 and 41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 34-36 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>08012006</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 20-31 and 34-41 are pending in this application.

### ***Election/Restrictions***

2. Claims 39 and 40 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on April 23, 2004.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 41 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The limitations of newly added claim 41 could not be found in the specification as originally filed. Support was cited as being on page 20 but

there is not a page 20 of the originally filed specification. Clarification is requested.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 20-31, 38 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kunihiro JP 10-333154, English translation from JPO).

Kunihiro discloses a method for orienting lyotropic liquid crystal. The orientation control of the lyotropic liquid crystal containing an isotropic solvent was not known until now [0003]. A photo-active molecule layer is orientated by diagonal irradiation or by irradiation with linear polarized light [0027]. A lyotropic liquid crystal is brought into contact with the orientated photo-active layer (abstract). Optically activated molecules used for the photo-alignment layer include aromatic azo-compounds [0010]-[0011]. The lyotropic liquid crystal is dissolved in a solvent [0031]. After the light orientation of the photosensitive layer, the LLC layer is heated. The lyotropic liquid crystal may change into an isotropic phase condition [0040].

The example teaches forming the photo-active molecular layer on a glass substrate and exposure using linearly polarized light through a photomask. The example also teaches using multiple liquid crystal solutions with different colors and that the photo-alignment layer is exposed multiple times. The photomask may generate birefringence. Various displays may be formed by combining two or more polarizing plates [0040]-[0049].

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kunihiro.

Kunihiro is silent on the thickness of the absorber film and does not disclose that this layer has a thickness of 0.3 to 1.5 microns. It would within the ordinary skill of one in the art to determine the optimal film thickness of the absorber layer in the method Kunihiro by routine experimentation and to have a thickness of 0.3 to 1.5 microns, if required, because thickness is a result-effective variable, and the discovery of an optimum value of a result

effective variable is ordinary within the skill of the art, as taught by *In re Boesch*, (617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980)).

### ***Response to Amendment***

6. The amendment filed 8/12/05 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132(a) because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132(a) states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows: the addition of or molecular ordering of certain organic photochemical substances in the paragraph beginning on page 12, line 1. Also in the paragraph beginning on page 12, line 12 "photo chromic" was changed to photochemical stable. However according to other teachings in the specification photo chromic and photochemically stable are not the same and therefore are not able to be interchanged without the introduction of new matter in the specification.

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

In reference to the first amendment discussed above, applicant argues that support is provided for this recitation on page 12 of the originally filed specification. The issue is that applicant has changed the particular

sentence to go from two processes (photochromic and photochemical) to include a third.

In reference to the second amendment, it is not clear to the examiner that the term was used erroneously.

### ***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments filed August 1, 2006 and May 1, 2006 have been considered and are considered persuasive in regards to the 35 USC 112 rejections in regard to the use of the term "photochemically stable".

Applicant's arguments filed August 1, 2006 and May 1, 2006 with respect to Kunihiro have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues photochromic process is occurring in Kunihiro versus the claimed invention. Kunihiro teaches light orientation and phase change.

The claims recite that azodye is photochemically stable but does not preclude a reversible change as recited in Kunihiro. The compounds of Kunihiro are azodyes which are photochemically stable (not dissociating or the like upon light irradiation).

***Allowable Subject Matter***


8. Claims 34-36 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

***Conclusion***

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Examiner K. Duda at (571) 272-1383. Official FAX communications should be sent to (571) 273-8300.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Huff, can be reached at 571-272-1385.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
Kathleen Duda  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1756